

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-6730

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JENNIFER MARIE DAVIS,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 10-6731

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JENNIFER MARIE DAVIS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Margaret B. Seymour, District Judge. (3:06-cr-00452-MBS-3; 3:09-cv-70032-MBS; 3:06-cr-00858-MBS-1; 3:09-cv-70033-MBS)

Submitted: April 14, 2011

Decided: April 22, 2011

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jennifer Marie Davis, Appellant Pro Se. Stanley Duane Ragsdale, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jennifer Marie Davis seeks to appeal the district court's order and amended order denying relief on her 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Davis has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss these appeals. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials

before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED